

REMARKS:

In the foregoing amendments, claims 1-3 were canceled and replaced with new claims 4-6. New claims 4-6 define the same subject matter as previously presented claims 1-3. After the foregoing amendments, claims 4-6 are the only claims pending in the application at this time. Claims 1-3 were rewritten as new claims 4-6 in response to the objections to the claims and the claim interpretation set forth on pages 2-5 of the Official action. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 4-6 overcome any objection to the claims set forth in the outstanding Office action. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw any objections to the claims.

The foregoing amendments were made in response to the numerous objections to the claims set forth in the outstanding Office action, which objections were not previously set forth. Accordingly, prior to the time of the present amendments, the applicant had no opportunity to respond to the objections to the claims that were newly set forth in the outstanding Office action. Since these amendments primarily correct editorial matters in response to the new objections to the claims, applicant respectfully requests that these amendments be entered under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.116(b) for the purposes of placing the application in condition for allowance or for the purposes of appeal.

- 4 -

Application No. 10/029,874
Attorney Docket No.: VX012398

The Official action set forth a single prior art rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent No. 6,828,963 of Rappoport. The statement of this rejection is set forth on pages 6-10 of the Official action. Applicant respectfully submits that the inventions defined in claims 4-6 are patently distinguishable from the teachings of Rappoport within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the following reasons.

The differences between applicant's claimed invention and the teachings of Rappoport are significant, and therefore, these teachings cannot anticipate nor render obvious applicant's claimed invention. For example, the teachings of Rappoport do not remotely contemplate or suggest the limitations in present claim 4 including:

- comparing the shape and reference data of the first three-dimensional model and shape and reference data of a second three-dimensional model to extract shape and reference data that are missing from the second three-dimensional model; and
- converting the extracted shape and reference data into information indicating the cause of the missing component and displaying the information on the screen.

In applicant's claimed invention, the shape and reference data of the two models (first and second three-dimensional models) is compared, so that the omitted information (among other things) from the previous model can be

shown on the display to assist the user in re-creating the previous model or correcting the current model. Since the device proposed by Rappoport is concerned with interpreting data between different CAD systems, this information and the use thereof in the completely different procedures of applicant's claims would not and cannot be suggested by these teachings. For such reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Rappoport do not disclose or suggest the inventions defined in present claims 4-6.

In addition, applicant cannot find where the teachings of Rappoport contemplate or suggest the limitations set forth in claims 5 and 6, where:


- where an approximate position of the missing component is calculated and the missing component is displayed at the approximated position on the incomplete second three-dimensional model on the screen, and
- where a modification plan to include the missing component on the incomplete second three-dimensional model is calculated and shown on the screen.

For the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Rappoport cannot contemplate or suggest the inventions as set forth in claims 4-6 within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §102 or 35 U.S.C. §103. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims and formally allow claims 4-6.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete and proper response to the Official action mailed February 15, 2006. While it is believed that all the claims in this application are in condition for allowance, should the examiner have any comments or questions, it is respectfully requested that the undersigned be telephoned at the below listed number to resolve any outstanding issues.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee therefor, as well as any other fees which become due, may be charged to our deposit account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,
POSZ LAW GROUP, PLC


R. Eugene Varndell, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,728

Atty. Docket No. VX012398
12040 South Lakes Drive
Suite 101
Reston, Virginia 20191
(703) 707-9110

\\ca\\2006\\KIMURA\\VX012398\\P052-2398 RS.DOC

- 7 -

Application No. 10/029,874
Attorney Docket No.: VX012398

MAY 15 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE


In re the application of:

Inventor(s) : Shinya KANO
Serial Number : 10/029,874
Filed : December 31, 2001
For : THREE-DIMENSIONAL CAD SYSTEM
Examiner : Luke R. Osborne
Group Art Unit : 2123

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence (Response After final Under 37 CFR 1.116, which totals eight pages including this certificate) is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (facsimile No. 571-273-8300) on May 15, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
POSZ LAW GROUP, PLLC


R. Eugene Varnell, Jr.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,728

Atty. Docket No. VX012398
12040 South Lakes Drive
Suite 101
Reston, Virginia 20191
(703) 707-9110

- 8 -

Application No. 10/029,874
Attorney Docket No.: VX012398